

REMARKS

The Advisory Action dated October 22, 2007 indicates that claims 1, 3, 9-12, 14-16, 23, 25-32, 34, 35, 37, and 39-44 are rejected. Applicants note that claims 7, 8, 33, 36, and 38 are not identified as being rejected in the Advisory Action. Applicants respectfully request clarification as to the status of claims 7, 8, 33, 36, and 38. In view of the following remarks, it is believed that claims 1, 3, 7-12, 14-16, 23, and 25-44 are allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1, 3, 7-12, 14-16, 23, and 25-44 is respectfully requested.

The Advisory Action dated October 22, 2007 states that there is no support in the specification for the limitation of the data bits being “simultaneously” input to the semiconductor device. Applicants respectfully submit that the specification at page 7, line 23 through page 8, line 4 explicitly refers to a number of data bits being simultaneously input or output. Specifically, the specification refers to a control signal C being activated when the input signal indicates that the number of data bits being simultaneously input to the semiconductor device or output from the semiconductor device is more than a predetermined number of bits (for example, 38 bits), and the control signal C being inactivated when the input signal indicates that the number of data bits being simultaneously input to the semiconductor device or output from the semiconductor device is less than the predetermined number of bits (for example, 18 bits). Thus, it follows that there is support in the specification for the limitation that data bits are simultaneously input to the semiconductor device.

The Advisory Action further states that the number of predetermined bits being greater than zero changes the scope of the invention. Applicants note that none of the amendments made to the claims includes a number of predetermined bits being greater than zero. Instead, in the Amendment After Final Rejection filed on October 10, 2007, claims 1, 10, 23, and 34 refer to

a predetermined number of bits being greater than one bit. Further, support for this claim amendment can be found at least at page 7, line 23 through page 8, line 4. For example, as stated in the specification, a control signal C is generated having a low level when a number of data bits is less than a predetermined bit number. One of ordinary skill understands that, if the predetermined number of bits is zero, as asserted by the Examiner in the previous Office Action, then the number of data bits would be less than zero in order to be less than the predetermined bit number, which, as clearly understood by one of ordinary skill, is not possible. Thus, it follows that the claim limitation "...greater than one bit..." is proper, and that no new matter is added by the claim limitations.


In view of the above, Applicants reaffirm the position that none of the references cited in the Office Action dated August 10, 2007 teaches or suggests the present invention, as claimed, for reasons stated in the Amendment After Final Rejection dated October 10, 2007. Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1, 3, 7-12, 14-16, 23, and 25-44 is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that all claims pending in the application are in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully solicited. If a telephone conference will expedite prosecution of the application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/31/07
Mills & Onello, LLP
Eleven Beacon Street, Suite 605
Boston, MA 02108
Telephone: (617) 994-4900
Facsimile: (617) 742-7774

J:\SAM\0529\secondamendmentafterfinalfiledwithRCE.doc


Steven M. Mills
Registration Number 36,610
Attorney for Applicants